



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/784,593	02/15/2001	Scott James Bennett	AUS920010006US1	5662
7590	12/23/2003		EXAMINER	
Duke W. Yee Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP P.O. Box 802334 Dallas, TX 75380			GOLINKOFF, JORDAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	
			DATE MAILED: 12/23/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/784,593	BENNETT ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Jordan S Golinkoff	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 February 2001.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 15 February 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ .
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2. 6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because Figure 7 is labeled as "Prior Art" but it is "an embodiment of the present invention" (§ Description of Drawings, pages 6-7, lines 32-1). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 11, 21, and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applicants Admitted Prior Art ("Applicant," Specification, pages 1-4) further in view of McGarvery (US005926631A).

As per independent claim 1, the Applicant discloses a method in a computer system, said method comprising the steps of:

- a. executing a UNIX-based operating system within said computer system (figure 2, element 202);
- b. executing a Java desktop within said UNIX-based operating system (figure 3, element 304);

- c. executing a window manager proxy within said UNIX-based operating system (figure 2, element 206);

The Applicant does not disclose:

- d. graphically presenting native Java applications within said computer system utilizing a graphical user interface;
- e. and graphically presenting native UNIX applications within said computer system utilizing said graphical user interface, wherein Java applications and UNIX applications are presented by said computer system utilizing the same graphical user interface.

McGarvey teaches to graphically present native Java applications within said computer system utilizing a graphical user interface (column 4, lines 36-38); and to graphically present native UNIX applications within said computer system utilizing said graphical user interface (column 4, lines 55-60), wherein Java applications and UNIX applications are presented by said computer system utilizing the same graphical user interface (column 10, lines 46-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of the Applicant with the teachings of McGarvey to include a method to graphically present native Java applications within said computer system utilizing a graphical user interface; and to graphically present native UNIX applications within said computer system utilizing said graphical user interface, wherein Java applications and UNIX applications are presented by said computer system utilizing the same graphical user interface with the motivation to allow the user the flexibility and efficiency of running both java applications and native applications on the same graphical user interface (McGarvey, column 4, lines 55-60).

Claims 11, 21, 31-33 are individually similar in scope to claims 1, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

4. Claims 2, 6, 16, 22, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applicants Admitted Prior Art (“Applicant,” Specification, pages 1-4) and McGarvey (US005926631A) and further in view of Giokas et al (“Giokas,” US005408602A).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, the teachings of the Applicant and McGarvey have been discussed above. The Applicant and McGarvey do not disclose the step of distributing window manager functions between said Java desktop and said window manager proxy.

Giokas teaches to distribute the window manager functions between more than one window management tool (column 6, lines 46-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of the combination of the Applicant and McGarvey with a means to distribute window management functions between more than one window management tool, with the motivation to distribute the processing of windowing tasks and to maintain a common look and feel to the interface (Giokas, column 6, lines 51-58).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 2, Giokas teaches that the step of distributing window manager functions to said window manager proxy further comprises the steps of: establishing a communication interface support within said window manager proxy for permitting applications to connect to and interact with said window manager proxy (column 7, lines 1-5); routing a first plurality of events (column 7, lines 1-5), utilizing said window

manager proxy, to said Java desktop for processing; and processing, by said window manager proxy, a second plurality of events (column 7, lines 1-5).

Claims 12, 22, 16, and 26 are similar in scope to claims 2, 2, 6, and 6, respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

5. Claims 10, 20, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applicants Admitted Prior Art ("Applicant," Specification, pages 1-4) and McGarvey (US005926631A) and further in view of Matthews et al. ("Matthews," US005974256A).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 2, the teachings of the Applicant and McGarvey have been discussed above. The Applicant and McGarvey do not disclose intercepting from one of said native UNIX applications, utilizing said window manager proxy, a frame window event to render a new window; forwarding, utilizing said window manager proxy, said frame window event to a Java Native Interface; translating said frame window event from a C language to a Java language utilizing said Java Native Interface; transmitting said translated frame window event to said Java desktop; and executing said translated frame window event utilizing said Java desktop, wherein said Java desktop renders said new window.

Matthews teaches to intercept from one of said native UNIX applications, utilizing said window manager proxy, a frame window event to render a new window (column 7, lines 60-65); forwarding, utilizing said window manager proxy, said frame window event to a Java Native Interface (column 8, lines 57-60); translating said frame window event from a C language to a Java language utilizing said Java Native Interface (column 8, lines 57-60); transmitting said translated frame window event to said Java desktop (column 8, lines 57-60, *i.e. Java Framework*); and executing said translated frame window event utilizing said Java desktop,

wherein said Java desktop renders said new window (column 9, lines 57-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of the combination of the Applicant and McGarvey with a means to intercept window events, translate these events using the Java Native Interface, and render windows on the Java Desktop, as taught by Matthews, with the motivation to allow platform independent user interaction with frame windows (column 1, lines 61-63).

Claims 20 and 30 are similar in scope to claims 10, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

6. Claims 3-5, 7-9, 13-15, 17-19, 23-25, and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applicants Admitted Prior Art ("Applicant," Specification, pages 1-4), McGarvey (US005926631A), and Giokas et al ("Giokas," US005408602A), and further in view of Matthews et al. ("Matthews," US005974256A).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, the teachings of the Applicant, McGarvey, and Giokas have been discussed above. The Applicant, McGarvey, and Giokas do not disclose creating frame windows for Java applications and native UNIX applications utilizing said Java desktop; managing user interactions with said frame windows utilizing said Java desktop; and utilizing, by said Java desktop, said window manager proxy to communicate with said native UNIX applications.

Matthews teaches to create frame windows for Java applications and native UNIX applications utilizing said Java desktop (column 2, lines 13-15); managing user interactions with said frame windows utilizing said Java desktop; and utilizing, by said Java desktop (column 2, lines 14-18), said window manager proxy to communicate with said native UNIX applications

(column 8, lines 56-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of the combination of the Applicant, McGarvey, and Giokas with a means to manage user interactions with frame windows using the Java Desktop and a window manager proxy, as taught by Matthews, with the motivation to allow platform independent user interaction with frame windows (Matthews, column 1, lines 61-63).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Giokas teaches the step of resizing, utilizing said Java desktop, frame windows for said native UNIX applications (figure 13).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 3, Giokas teaches the step of moving, utilizing said Java desktop, frame windows for said native UNIX applications (figure 14).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, the teachings of the Applicant, McGarvey, and Giokas have been discussed above. The Applicant, McGarvey, and Giokas do not disclose that the step of routing a first plurality of events further comprises the steps of: translating said first plurality of events from a first language to a second language utilizing a translator; and forwarding said translated first plurality of events to said Java.

Matthews teaches that the step of routing a first plurality of events further comprises the steps of: translating said first plurality of events from a first language to a second language utilizing a translator; and forwarding said translated first plurality of events to said Java desktop (column 3, lines 55-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of the combination of the Applicant, McGarvey, and Giokas with a means to translate a first plurality of events from a first language to a second language utilizing a translator; and forwarding said translated first plurality of events to said

Java desktop, as taught by Matthews, with the motivation to allow platform independent user interaction with frame windows (Matthews, column 1, lines 61-63).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 6, the teachings of the Applicant, McGarvey, and Giokas have been discussed above. The Applicant, McGarvey, and Giokas do not disclose that the step of translating said first plurality of events utilizing a translator further comprises the step of translating said first plurality of events utilizing a Java Native Interface.

Matthews teaches the step of translating said first plurality of events utilizing a translator further comprises the step of translating said first plurality of events utilizing a Java Native Interface (column 8, lines 57-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of the combination of the Applicant, McGarvey, and Giokas with a means to translate a first plurality of events utilizing a Java Native Interface, as taught by Matthews, with the motivation to allow platform independent user interaction with frame windows (Matthews, column 1, lines 61-63).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 7, Matthews teaches the steps of: translating said first plurality of events from a C language to a Java language (column 8, lines 57-60); and forwarding said translated first plurality of events to said Java desktop (column 8, lines 57-60).

Claims 13-15, 23-25, 17-19, and 27-29 are similar in scope to claims 3-5, 3-5, 7-9, and 7-9, respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kwong et al. (US006289506B1) teaches the use of a Java Desktop providing window management functions

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jordan S Golinkoff whose telephone number is 703-305-8771. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Jordan Golinkoff
Patent Examiner
December 4, 2003

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100